

An attack on one group in our country is truly an attack on all of us. By passing the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act, we can come together on a bipartisan basis to show that the U.S. Senate will not be a bystander to the wave of racist, anti-Asian violence in our country. So let's get it done together.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MALLORY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Mallory nomination?

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 150 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Portman
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blackburn	Grassley	Paul
Blunt	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Toomey
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Rounds Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The majority whip is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 13, S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Jeff Merkley, Tammy Baldwin, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Bernard Sanders, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jacky Rosen, Chris Van Hollen, Ron Wyden, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 151 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Barrasso	Hagerty	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blackburn	Heinrich	Risch
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cardin	King	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Lankford	Sinema
Cassidy	Leahy	Smith
Collins	Lee	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Moran	Warren
Ernst	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	

NAYS—6

Cotton	Hawley	Paul
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—2

Rounds Tillis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 92, the nays are 6.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

COVID-19 HATE CRIMES ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will proceed to legislative session to consider the motion to proceed to S. 937, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. S. 937, a bill to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Americans were horrified to witness a recent series of mass shootings involving the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community. On March 16, 2021, mass shootings occurred at three spas and massage parlors in the Atlanta metropolitan area. Eight people were killed, six of whom were Asian-American women, and one other person was wounded. The suspect was taken into custody that day and has been charged with multiple counts of murder. The investigation is continuing as to whether the suspect should be additionally charged with hate crimes, if he deliberately targeted Asian Americans with this senseless violence.

Unfortunately, this mass shooting is not an isolated incident in the United States in terms of hate speech, hate crimes, and violence against Asian Americans in our communities. Sadly, some political figures have used the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic to fan the flames of hate by promoting stereotypes, fear, and xenophobia. Irrationally blaming Asian and Asian-American neighbors for the pandemic is simply wrong and reprehensible and can have deadly consequences.

Let us remember that our Asian-American brothers and sisters are an integral part of the United Nations on so many levels. Our immigrant story and our diversity are some of our unique strengths, not weaknesses, of the United States of America.

There are about 23 million Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States, constituting 7 percent of the population of our country.

There are approximately 2 million Asian-American owned businesses that generate over \$700 billion in annual revenue and employ millions of workers.

Two million Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are working on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic as first responders and in healthcare, law enforcement, transportation, supermarkets, and other service industries. Our Asian-American brothers and sisters are putting their lives on the line every day to help protect our communities during the pandemic. That is why it is so despicable to see the rise of anti-Asian rhetoric and hate speech by political leaders and others, which inevitably gives oxygen to extremist groups and individuals and gives license to individuals to commit hate crimes and acts of violence.

The use of anti-Asian terminology and rhetoric related to COVID-19, such as the “Chinese virus,” the “Wuhan virus,” the “Kung flu”—phrases often used by former President Trump and some of his followers—has perpetrated an anti-Asian stigma. The use of anti-Asian rhetoric has resulted in Asian Americans being harassed, assaulted, and scapegoated for the COVID-19 pandemic.

Since January 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in reports of hate crimes and incidents against those of Asian descent throughout the Nation. According to a recent report, there were nearly 3,800 reported cases of anti-Asian discrimination related to COVID-19 between March 2020 and February 2021.

On April 3, 2021, the New York Times ran an analysis article on the rising tide of Asian-American violence entitled “Swelling Anti-Asian Violence: Who is Being Attacked Where.”

The article stated:

Over the last year, in an unrelenting series of episodes . . . people of Asian descent have been pushed, beaten, kicked, spit on and called slurs. Homes and businesses have been vandalized. The violence has known no boundaries, spanning generations, income brackets and regions. . . . Those cases include the fatal attack of a Thai man in January, as well as the assaults of a 91-year-old man in Oakland’s Chinatown and an 89-year-old woman in Brooklyn. Those episodes, and other[s] . . . have terrified the Asian community.

The article continues:

But there is no ambiguity about the cases The Times collected: These are assaults in which the assailants expressed explicit racial hostility with their language, and in which nearly half included a reference to the coronavirus.

This article pointed out some sobering statistics when it comes to hate crimes. Over the last year, hate crimes as classified and reported by the police rose at a faster pace against people of Asian descent than hate crimes overall. In New York City and Boston, hate crimes overall fell while anti-Asian hate crimes spiked.

In New York City alone, the number of hate crimes with Asian-American victims reported to the New York Police Department jumped to 28 last year, up from 3 in 2019, and so far this year, the Department is actively investigating or has solved 35 anti-Asian bias crimes.

Congresswoman GRACE MENG, of New York, said:

We’ve gone from being invisible to being seen as subhuman. We just want to be seen as American, like everyone else.

On April 9, 2021, the Washington Post ran an article examining the effect of mass shootings on marginalized groups and how trauma ripples through those communities.

The article stated:

March 16 marked a turning point for many Asian Americans: It was the day their community was stricken by a mass shooting, becoming the latest minority group to suffer an attack that killed several of its own . . . There’s a specific kind of grief that arises from being targeted, one that more and more marginalized people in the United States know too well. The shooting survivors and victims’ family members span geographies, races and religions, but they are bonded by the shared trauma they have experienced.

The article continues:

These tragedies often leave many in those communities who weren’t directly affected feeling unsafe and traumatized. After a shooting, many members of these communities say they felt hyper-aware of their race and an escalated sense of fear that the same could happen to them or those they love. A mass shooting seems less senseless or inexplicable when it’s directed at one of your own.

I recall with sorrow that in 2018 a gunman killed 11 Jewish worshipers at the Tree of Life in Pittsburgh.

The article continues:

Tree of Life Rabbi Jeffrey Myers said his synagogue practices the “ministry of presence”. . . . After mass shootings, synagogue members reach out to the affected communities and let them know that they’re present, they’re listening.

The Georgia massacre “increases the fear level now of all Asian Americans who prayed, “Am I next?” I know how that feels to have your community wonder, “Am I next?” said Myers, a survivor of the deadliest attack against Jews on American soil.

In recent weeks, flyers have recirculated at Asian-American restaurants—posted in the synagogue’s Squirrel Hill neighborhood after the 2018 Pittsburgh shooting—to show their support for the Jewish community.

One read:

Many of our business members have thrived in this city, particularly in Squirrel Hill, and if we shared in this good fortune, then we bear the burdens.

It was a reminder that Asian Americans and Jews share similar status as minority communities in the United States and now as communities affected by mass shootings.

I was pleased that, shortly after taking office, President Biden issued a Presidential memorandum, “Condemning and Combating Racism, Xenophobia, and Intolerance Against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States.”

We need to stop the hate. Referring to this global pandemic by anything other than its appropriate, medical names has inflamed the worst stereotypes, fear, and xenophobia in the face of a health crisis. Irrationally blaming

Asian or Asian-American neighbors and random strangers is simply un-American. The Senate and every person in this country needs to call out the hate, bullying, and scapegoating whenever we see it and work together as one community to overcome COVID-19.

In my home State of Maryland, I was pleased to see that, last week, Governor Larry Hogan announced the formation of a statewide workgroup charged with developing strategies, recommendations, and actions to address the rise in violence and discrimination targeting the Asian-American community.

Governor Hogan named the former U.S. attorney for the District of Maryland, Robert K. Hur, to chair the workgroup and spearhead the effort. Mr. Hur was the first Asian American to serve as our U.S. attorney in Maryland’s history, and I had the pleasure of working with him extensively on a number of criminal matters and civil rights issues during his tenure.

I also want to commend the work of our current acting U.S. attorney in Maryland and our FBI Special Agent in Charge, Jennifer C. Boone. They put out a recent statement which condemned bigotry and hatred against the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community and encouraged members of the public to report to law enforcement incidents of violence, threats, and harassment.

Shortly before the shootings in Atlanta, the U.S. Attorney’s Office for Maryland, on March 10, 2021, launched its Civil Rights Unit to ensure that the full spectrum of criminal and civil statutes are employed in addressing hate crimes and discrimination; to conduct outreach to government, not-for-profit, and private entities in Maryland; and to help provide training and resources to local and State law enforcement in Maryland.

Today, I rise in support of S. 937, the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act, introduced by Senator HIRONO of Hawaii. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. I urge the Senate to pass this legislation without further delay.

This legislation would direct the U.S. Department of Justice to designate a DOJ employee to assist with the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes reported to Federal, State, and/or local law enforcement. The legislation would provide guidance for State and local law enforcement agencies to establish the online reporting of hate crimes or incidents and to have online reporting available in multiple languages; expand culturally competent and appropriate public education and the collection of data and public reporting of hate crimes; and issue guidance detailing best practices to mitigate racially discriminatory language in describing the COVID-19 pandemic, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the COVID-19 Health Equity Task Force, and community-based organizations.

In the 117th Congress, I was privileged to be named as the chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission. I additionally serve as the Special Representative on Anti-Semitism, Racism, and Intolerance for the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly.

Over the past year, the world has suffered the crippling impact of COVID-19, which has disproportionately affected our most vulnerable citizens. Racist violence has, once again, reared its ugly head in many OSCE participating States, including our own. I pledge to continue working with the Helsinki Commission and the OSCE to shine a spotlight on discrimination, racism, and anti-Asian violence both at home and abroad as we work together with our partners in the United States and around the world to share best practices and combat this scourge against our democracy and freedoms we hold so dear.

In 2019, at the annual meeting of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly in Luxembourg, I chaired a section dealing with anti-Semitism. One of the key findings that came out of that section was that every community needs to work together. We are all in this together. An attack on one community is an attack on all of us and the freedom of all of us, and we must join in unity to speak with a clear, strong voice against any of these hate activities.

We now need an all-hands-on-deck approach to combat anti-Asian bias, prejudice, discrimination, hate crimes, and violence. In working together—all communities—with our local, State, national, and international partners, along with our allies in the private sector and faith community, we can stem this dangerous trend and give a sense of peace and security back to our Asian-American brothers and sisters. It starts with our taking up the legislation before us and passing it promptly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we are very pleased that the Senate just took an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote—92 to 6—to move forward with legislation to fight the surge of anti-Asian violence across our country in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Anti-Asian bigotry and violence is a very serious issue that has deep roots in our country's history. Regrettably, it has grown far worse over the last year. It is something that affects constituents in all of our States and has proud Asian-American citizens fearing for their safety. I have been told stories that make me ache: an older Asian

gentleman afraid to go outside because he would be cursed at, berated, even spat upon. A young lady told me she would no longer take the subway to work because the stares at her were so angry and intense that it was just unnerving. Then it is worse with assaults and violence and even a death.

We need to do something, and I am so glad that our Republican colleagues have voted with us to proceed with this legislation. This was never intended as gotcha legislation. It was always intended as bipartisan legislation, and for the information of the Senate, we are making good progress on reaching a bipartisan agreement with sensible, germane, and constructive amendments coming from Republican colleagues—the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from Maine—that, I believe, make the bill even stronger. So we want to continue with this bipartisan process.

I intend the first amendment to the bill to be an amendment offered by Senators Moran and Blumenthal. We are working with the Republican leader to determine if and how many other amendments to the bill there will be so that we can consider them and vote on final passage without any gotcha or not germane amendments, but we are moving this bill forward because it does need to go forward with a sense of urgency.

The legislation will send a loud and clear message that racism and violence against Asian Americans have no place—no place—in American society. We should endeavor to finish our work as quickly as possible and without delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, the United States is a beacon of democracy in the world, and our Nation was founded on free and fair elections, but if the American people don't have confidence in our elections, we don't have a sustainable democracy.

What we saw this past election was confusion and chaos caused by inconsistent standards and last-minute changes to established election laws by State officials and activist judges. Yet it is not just the chaos from this past election that troubles Americans across the country. For more than a decade, growing numbers of Americans have become less confident that their votes were accurately cast and counted. If we want to continue as a thriving democracy, we have to reverse this trend and take action so Americans trust in free and fair elections. There is no other option.

That is why I have joined my colleagues in introducing the Save Democracy Act to restore faith in our Federal elections and guarantee that voters decide the outcomes of elections, not the courts, and that is why I am here today to ask my colleagues to join me in passing one specific section

of the Save Democracy Act—the Promoting Election Integrity by Proving Voter Identity Act—to require voter ID.

It is pretty simple. If you want to vote in person, you will need to bring your current and valid ID. If you want to vote by mail, you will need to provide a copy of your ID. Like I said, it is pretty simple and straightforward. We want 100 percent participation in our elections and zero percent fraud. We want it to be easy to vote and hard to cheat. Voter ID helps us to meet that goal.

Of course, the Democrats will do anything to fight against these commonsense reforms. It is absurd. You have to have ID to drive a car, board a plane, open a bank account, and pick up a prescription. Do they object to that? Of course not. These are much needed, commonsense reforms to our election systems.

Just look at what is happening in Georgia. Two recent news articles show that President Biden and the Democrats spread lies to pressure companies to boycott Georgia over commonsense voting laws even though the Washington Post gave President Biden four Pinocchios for his lies about the Georgia law.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two articles I have with me today which outline how much the Democrats have been grossly misleading the public.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 2021]

BIDEN FALSELY CLAIMS THE NEW GEORGIA LAW 'ENDS VOTING HOURS EARLY'

(By Glenn Kessler)

"What I'm worried about is how un-American this whole initiative is. It's sick. It's sick . . . deciding that you're going to end voting at five o'clock when working people are just getting off work."—President Biden, in remarks at a news conference, March 25

"Among the outrageous parts of this new state law, it ends voting hours early so working people can't cast their vote after their shift is over."—Biden, in a statement "on the attack on the right to vote in Georgia," March 26

During his first news conference, President Biden became especially passionate when discussing a law being pressed by Republican lawmakers in Georgia that he said was intended to make it harder for people to vote. He reiterated those concerns the next day in a written statement after Gov. Brian Kemp (R) signed the bill into law.

The law has come under fire for restricting the distribution of food and water to people standing in line, making it harder to cast absentee ballots, reducing drop boxes for mail ballots, barring mobile voting places and for making significant procedural changes that potentially give more power to the GOP-controlled legislature in the election process.

Biden has echoed many of those concerns. But there was one line in both his news conference and his statement that has kept us puzzling until our puzzler was sore. It also puzzled experts who have studied the new law.

Let's take a look.

THE FACTS

On Election Day in Georgia, polling places are open from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., and if you are

in line by 7 p.m., you are allowed to cast your ballot. Nothing in the new law changes those rules.

However, the law did make some changes to early voting. But experts say the net effect of the new early-voting rules was to expand the opportunities to vote for most Georgians, not limit them.

"You can criticize the bill for many things, but I don't think you can criticize it for reducing the hours you can vote," said University of Georgia political scientist Charles S. Bullock III. He speculated that Biden may have been briefed on an early version of the bill—"there were 25 versions floating around"—and he did not get an update on the final version.

For instance, at one point lawmakers considered nixing all early voting on Sundays, thus eliminating "souls to the polls," a get-out-the-vote initiative popular with predominantly Black churches. But that idea was scrapped in the end.

"One of the biggest changes in the bill would expand early voting access for most counties, adding an additional mandatory Saturday and formally codifying Sunday voting hours as optional," Stephen Fowler of Georgia Public Broadcasting said in an excellent and comprehensive report on the impact of the new law. "Counties can have early voting open as long as 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., or 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. at minimum. If you live in a larger metropolitan county, you might not notice a change. For most other counties, you will have an extra weekend day, and your weekday early voting hours will likely be longer."

Charles Stewart III, an election expert at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said: "I had also heard this generally reported as expanding early voting, so I'm surprised by the characterization." He studied the precise language changes at our request and said it indicated an expansion of hours, especially in rural counties.

So where would Biden get this perception that ordinary workers were getting the shaft because the state would "end voting at five o'clock"? We have one clue.

The law used to say early "voting shall be conducted during normal business hours." Experts said that generally means 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The new law makes it specific—"beginning at 9:00 AM and ending at 5:00 PM." A Georgia election official said the change was made in part because some rural county election offices only worked part time during the week, not a full eight-hour day, so the shift to more specific times makes it clear they must be open every weekday for at least eight hours.

But, as noted, the law also allows individual counties to set the hours anywhere between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. So the practical effect of the 5 p.m. reference in the law is minimal.

During the 2020 election, for instance, vote-rich Fulton County, with a substantial Black population, set early-voting hours at 8:30 a.m. to 6 p.m. on most weekdays and two Saturdays, though the last weekdays had 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. voting hours. Voting was allowed on two Sundays between 12 p.m. and 6 p.m.

Under the new law, Fulton County could set the exact same hours for in-person early voting—or expand them from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. every day.

Bullock noted that one change in the law may impact early voting in runoff elections. The law reduced the period between the initial election and the runoff election, from nine to four weeks, potentially shortening the period for early voting.

We were curious what the early-voting rules were in Delaware, Biden's home state. It turns out Delaware did not allow any in-

person early voting in 2020. A law signed in 2019 will permit early voting starting in 2022. (Voting hours are 7 a.m. to 8 p.m. on Election Day.)

We sought an explanation from the White House for the reason for Biden's remarks but did not receive an on-the-record response.

THE PINOCCHIO TEST

Biden framed his complaint in terms of a slap at working people. The law would "end voting at five o'clock when working people are just getting off work" or "ends voting hours early so working people can't cast their vote after their shift is over."

Many listeners might assume he was talking about voting on Election Day, not early voting. But Election Day hours were not changed.

As for early voting, the law made a modest change, replacing a vague "normal business hours"—presumed to be 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.—to a more specific 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. time period. But that's the minimum. Under the new law, counties have the option to extend the voting hours so voters can start casting ballots as early as 7 a.m. and as late as 7 p.m.—the same as Election Day in Georgia. Moreover, an additional mandatory day of early voting on Saturday was added and two days of early voting on Sunday were codified as an option for counties.

One could understand a flub in a news conference. But then this same claim popped up in an official presidential statement. Not a single expert we consulted who has studied the law understood why Biden made this claim, as this was the section of law that expanded early voting for many Georgians.

Somehow Biden managed to turn that expansion into a restriction aimed at working people, calling it "among the outrageous parts" of the law. There's no evidence that is the case. The president earns Four Pinocchios.

[From Fox News, Apr. 12, 2021]

WARNOCK ADMITS TO SIGNING EMAIL WITH FALSE INFORMATION ABOUT GEORGIA VOTING LAW

(By David Rutz)

Sen. Raphael Warnock, D-Ga., admitted to signing off on false information in a third-party advocacy group's email that went out about the Georgia voting law after it passed.

The Washington Post flagged an email Warnock signed from the liberal nonprofit 3.14 Action as an example of Democratic misinformation about the sweeping Georgia voting reforms, as it claimed the new law restricted weekend early voting and ended no-excuse mail voting.

"Sen. Raphael G. Warnock, one of two new Democratic senators representing Georgia, signed an email sent out by the advocacy group 3.14 Action after the law passed, which claimed it ended no-excuse mail voting and restricted early voting on the weekends—also early proposals that did not become law," the Post reported.

Those ideas were considered but did not make it into the final bill, which actually expands early voting in Georgia to 17 days, including two Saturdays. It also still allows no-excuse absentee voting, albeit with a shorter window of 67 days to apply.

The statement went out on March 30, five days after Georgia Gov. Brian Kemp, a Republican, signed the final bill into law.

A Warnock campaign spokesperson told Fox News it approved the text of the group's email before Kemp signed the bill, while the provisions were still under consideration. The spokesperson noted the Georgia Senate passed a bill to end no-excuse absentee voting earlier in March, and the Georgia House originally proposed restricting weekend early voting.

However, neither provision made it into the final bill, as the 3.14 Action statement Warnock signed appeared to claim.

The law has been the subject of fierce controversy, with President Biden and other Democrats likening it to racist "Jim Crow"-era restrictions. Kemp and other state Republicans have pushed back on the criticism and said the reforms strengthen voting integrity.

Biden has also disseminated false information about the law, getting Four Pinocchios from The Washington Post's Fact-Checker for claiming the law limits voting hours.

The firestorm around the law has already economically hurt Georgia. Bowing to liberal pressure and outrage from Georgia-based corporations like Delta and Coca-Cola, Major League Baseball Commissioner Rob Manfred pulled the 2021 All-Star Game out of Atlanta's Truist Park, costing the area up to an estimated \$100 million in potential revenue.

Warnock said he was disappointed by MLB's decision but framed it as the fault of Republicans, calling it an "unfortunate" consequence of the voting bill.

"It is my hope that businesses, athletes, and entertainers can protest this law not by leaving Georgia but by coming here and fighting voter suppression head on, and hand-in-hand with the community," he said in a statement.

The new Georgia lawmaker is a staunch supporter of the For The People Act, a sweeping national voting bill which Republicans have slammed as a massive federal overreach and Democratic power grab.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. It just goes to show you how out of touch the Democrats really are.

All my Republican colleagues and I want to see is more Americans vote, and I am thankful Senators BARRASSO and CRAMER are joining me in this effort today. We want a vibrant democracy in which citizens are engaged and participating in government at every level.

Sadly, the Democrats are refusing to work with us to protect our voting systems. Instead, the Democrats want to make it easier to cheat and harder to stop election fraud. That is why the Democrats are pushing H.R. 1, which would perpetuate distrust in our elections, impose anti-democratic mandates, and further erode our country's institutions. H.R. 1 is the most radical piece of voting legislation this Nation has ever seen at a time when restoring confidence in elections has never been more important.

H.R. 1 removes the most basic safeguards against election fraud. The Democrat solution to election security is the same as their solution to all problems: a completely inept, big-government approach that fails at every level.

Before continuing, I would like to yield to my colleague from Wyoming and thank him for his leadership on this effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to join my colleague from Florida, former Governor and now U.S. Senator, and talk about the Save Democracy Act and the issues that are facing our Nation today, and I want to

do that because over the past several weeks, Democrats, the media, their corporate allies have been misleading the American people about our voting laws.

Democrats have been pushing a false narrative all around the country, trying to scare Americans into pushing and pressuring Congress into passing a Federal election takeover.

Federal election laws and State election laws, as guided by our Constitution, say that it is States that should be making the decisions about how we run our elections at home. But what you see coming out of the Democrats in their H.R. 1—that is called S. 1—is a law that changes things dramatically and takes decisions out of the folks at home in Wyoming and puts them in the hands of folks in Washington, DC. People in Wyoming, as I talked to them the last 2 weeks, don't want anything to do with that.

Now, Democrats have this listed as their No. 1 priority bill for the year; otherwise, why would they have listed it as No. 1? Not coronavirus, not pandemic, not infrastructure—no, taking elections away from the States, putting them in the hands of Washington.

The bill is over 800 pages long. Virtually every page would, I believe, make it easier to cheat. That is not what the American people want. They want to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat.

The bill, H.R. 1, now S. 1, expands ballot harvesting, which is where paid political operatives, unsupervised, can go door to door, nursing home bed to nursing home bed, picking up people's ballots and deciding which ballots to turn in and which ballots to destroy.

The bill would register people automatically when they sign up for Medicaid or assistance in other forms from the government. It would force taxpayers to fund political campaigns and political operatives. Paying for campaign ads, your tax dollars would go for that and things that—a candidacy you are not for, and you would be paying for their ads and their computer time and their web pages and their yard signs. People in Wyoming don't want that.

When I describe each one of these to the people of Wyoming, they say: Don't let that happen to America.

I think many Democrats haven't read the 800 pages, and I know if the American people read the 800 pages, they would be just as upset as the people in Wyoming who have heard what is in the bill.

The American people want security in elections. We want integrity, accountability, transparency in how it all works, and that is why I am so proud to be here and supporting Senator SCOTT and cosponsoring, along with Senator HYDE-SMITH and Senator LUMMIS, a bill that gives confidence to people in elections, because our bill—overall bill bans voter harvesting. It says no to automatic registration. It requires at least a Social Security

number to register to vote. Under our bill, you could still vote by mail, as people have done year after year in Wyoming—done it very successfully. You just need to request a ballot, say your information is up-to-date, and then you get the ballot in the mail—basic commonsense measures to protect against fraud and against error.

So the differences between what we propose and what the Democrats propose could not be more clear. I believe the Democrat bill makes it easier to commit fraud; the Republican bill makes it harder to commit fraud.

If the Democrat bill were good, they wouldn't need to use scare tactics, which they have been using all across the country, and wouldn't need to spread false information.

So the people of Wyoming tell me they want elections to be fair. They want them to be free from voter fraud. They want it to be easier to vote, as I said, harder to cheat, and just basically using an identification card or a means to identify yourself when you go to vote would make common sense. That is what we do in Wyoming, and it should be continued to be allowed so when someone shows up to vote, they can just confirm that they are who they say they are.

And that is why I am proud to stand here today with Senator SCOTT and support him on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, we can and must pass commonsense reforms to restore confidence in our elections.

The easiest thing we can do right now is require voter ID. Americans agree this is a necessary step.

If we are serious about working together to move our country forward, restore public trust, and protect the democracy our Nation cherishes, we need to pass my bill today, and I look forward to all my colleagues joining me to protect our democracy.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1130, introduced earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, my colleagues have talked about free and fair elections, but I am quite concerned that this bill does quite the opposite.

I am really quite stunned that one would think that a bill that dictates exactly how every State has to use an ID law affects the access to the ballot box for every single American, that it would be requested that it would be passed with no process, no possibility of a committee to examine the fact that every single American voter is im-

pacted by this effort to erect a barricade between the voter and the ballot box.

I was thinking about how, when we were here on January 6, the boxes that had the electoral college votes—gorgeous, ornate, old wooden boxes were here on the counter, and they are just a symbol of the pulsating heart of our Republic, the ability of every citizen to participate in the vision for their country, how their country will operate, how their children will have an opportunity to thrive—that ballot box.

So here is a bill designed to make it harder to get your voice heard, harder to get your ballot counted, being asked to be considered by this Chamber with absolutely no process of committee deliberation.

If we had such a process, it would be pointed out that currently millions of Americans don't have the IDs required in this measure. Well, that makes it a lot harder for millions of Americans to vote.

It would also be pointed out in the committee process that of those who don't have those IDs, about three times as many Black Americans don't have those IDs as White Americans, even though Black Americans are a much smaller percentage of the American population, which means that this measure is hugely discriminatory against Black Americans. And it is just wrong to engage in that type of discrimination in an effort to manipulate the outcome of elections.

Now, it would be quite a different conversation if we had evidence that there were an actual, real problem being addressed. But, fortunately, this has been studied time and time and time again. We had the Governor of Michigan testifying here on Capitol Hill just a few days ago, and we asked when they did the study—the investigation because of the lawsuits that were filed related to the last election—how many people voted illegally in vote by mail. And that effort to find the evidence of fraud turned out, she said, zero. Zero.

And I asked her a question because I was stunned that it was zero. Certainly one person who thought they were a citizen but wasn't a citizen and voted who was found? Zero. Zero.

And there is study after study after study. So we understand what this is, and that is what would be explored in committee. It is an effort to make it harder for Americans to vote.

It is not about security because there is not a security problem. It is about the fact that this disproportionately affects low-income Americans and Black Americans.

So I stand here today considering whether to object because I believe in that vision of Americans having a full, free, fair chance to be involved in their elections, defending the ballot box for every single American, and this bill does the opposite.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, my goal is 100 percent participation and zero percent fraud. It is not voter suppression or racist to prove your identity for in-person voting. It is not voter suppression or racist to prove your identity for mail-in voting. It is not voter suppression or racist to require ballot boxes to be monitored. It is not voter suppression or racist to make sure your vote is in on time.

My colleague wants to call any attempt to fight fraud in our elections voter suppression. My colleague wants to call any attempt to fight fraud in elections racist. That is just not accurate.

Voter ID should not be controversial. You need an ID to get on a plane, open a bank account, drive a car—even an ID to get into the White House. But we shouldn't have an ID to vote for the President? It just doesn't make sense.

Americans believe in voter ID. It is a logical step to make our elections more secure, and it is a simple change we can pass today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMERICAN MANUFACTURING

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first, I want to say I want to thank the Senator from Oregon for objecting to the previous motion, and I share his concerns.

I rise today to speak about some big choices our Nation has to make. Will we continue to limp along with an economy that works for only a few wealthy people or will we invest in making things in America and in our infrastructure and, most importantly, in our people?

Will we continue to allow other countries to outpace us on technology while remaining dependent on critical parts made on the other side of the globe or will we seize a future that is made in America?

And will we continue to ignore the climate crisis and leave it for the next generation to deal with and leave an even bigger catastrophe or will we take action right now—right now—to put our Nation on a path to a future of good-paying jobs fueled by clean energy?

I have often said that in Michigan we don't have an economy unless someone makes something and somebody grows something. That is what we do in Michigan. We make things and grow things. And I know that my friend, the Presiding Officer from Minnesota, feels the same—making things, growing things. That is how we have an economy. It has been the secret to our success in Michigan and in so many other places around the country. We need to make things, and we need to grow things.

Unfortunately, while we have been talking about making things for a long time, the rest of the world has actually been acting.

It is estimated that the Chinese Government has invested at least \$100 bil-

lion to support its electric vehicle industry. That might be why they have hundreds of companies making electric vehicles.

You can't build a competitive auto industry without electric vehicles, and you can't build electric vehicles without a whole lot of batteries and a whole lot of other component parts. They could all be made here, but most of them aren't.

Right now, none of the major electric vehicle battery providers are American companies. They could be if we helped partner with them to make that happen.

And we have seen what happens when our automakers depend on semiconductors made overseas. Over the past few months, a shortage of computer chips no bigger than a Kellogg's cornflake have idled multiple plants and led to layoffs in Michigan and across the country.

In fact, the Alliance for Auto Innovation estimates that U.S. automakers will produce a million fewer cars this year because of this shortage of this little chip.

It is not enough to say we need to build things in America. We all know that. But we can't build things here without first investing in our capacity and having a national strategy to build things here in America. Thankfully, we have a President of the United States who understands that. He understands the moment we are in and is ready to meet the moment.

Now it is time for Congress to step up. Senate Democrats are excited and ready to take action, working with the President of the United States and hopefully working with our colleagues across the aisle, in this moment for America and America's future.

It is important to note that it won't be the first time that actions we have taken here have had lasting consequences. More than 100 years ago, Henry Ford and Thomas Edison partnered to build an affordable electric car. That was the first kind of car they wanted to make—an electric car. They even built several prototypes in Dearborn, MI. The challenge, Ford told the New York Times in 1914, was "to build a storage battery of light weight which would operate for long distances without recharging." Sound familiar? That is a challenge most of our automakers are very familiar with.

Interestingly, around the same time, in 1916, Congress passed a change to the tax laws that in effect provided oil and gas companies interest-free loans. It was America's first fossil fuel subsidy.

Perhaps it is no surprise, then, that given the various issues and struggles and costs, Ford chose to focus on an internal combustion engine.

Just thinking about it, more than 100 years later, we are still lighting prehistoric plants and animals on fire to get to the grocery store and to get to work.

Now, it is true that my home State of Michigan benefited from these choices.

We put the world on wheels. We are extremely proud of our place in history and extremely proud of the wonderful workers, the skill and ability of our workers. But I also understand that we would have been better off today if the issues of carbon pollution had been addressed at the very beginning.

The good news is that we have the opportunity now to fulfill Ford and Edison's electric vision. Just last week, I toured GM's new Factory ZERO, which soon will be building electric Hummers and electric Chevy Silverado trucks. These are big vehicles, and they are going to be all electric. It is very exciting. Stellantis has plans to build four new electric hybrid Jeeps in Detroit, and Henry Ford's company is investing more than \$22 billion to introduce electric versions of its vehicles, including Mustangs, Ford F-150 trucks, and commercial vans—all very exciting.

These changes are what we need right now, but our car companies can't do it without a partnership with us, with the Federal Government. Just as companies around the world have not had to do it alone, we need to make sure we are partnering with them to actualize this vision for the future.

You know, the oil companies like to say—whenever we talk about various incentives for wind or solar or electric vehicles or batteries, they always like to say: We shouldn't be picking winners and losers in our country. But I would argue that in 1916, with the first fossil fuel subsidy, our country picked a winner, and they have been subsidized over and over again and winning the energy race ever since. In fact, that subsidy is to the tune of at least \$20 billion every year. Even in the tax cuts in 2017, the Republican tax cuts for the wealthiest and most well-connected people in the country, there was even another new foreign oil tax break in there.

I would argue it is time to give equal opportunity to competing technology and level the playing field. At the same time, we can create good-paying jobs here at home, revitalize American manufacturing, and put America in the driver's seat of the clean energy future. That, we can do—that is so exciting to do—if we work with our President to get this done.

If we are going to build back better, it is time to start building. The first thing we can do is to pass the American Jobs Plan, which invests in American manufacturing, creates an American supply chain for products and technologies, and strengthens "Buy American" laws. This plan has been long overdue, I can tell you, and it is just the start of what we need to do.

My bipartisan American Jobs in Energy Manufacturing Act, which I introduced with Senator MANCHIN and Senator DAINES, would provide incentives for manufacturers to build and retool existing plants to make advanced energy parts like semiconductors and batteries and retool for electric vehicle

facilities. It builds on the successful 48C advanced energy manufacturing tax credit, which I authored in 2009. That helped boost U.S. manufacturing and create good-paying jobs then, and we can do it now.

On the Finance Committee, we are also working on legislation that would provide an investment tax credit for building American battery, semiconductor, and solar cell plants and a corresponding tax credit for producing these key components.

I am so pleased that President Biden's American Jobs Plan includes electric charging stations as part of our infrastructure investment—it certainly is part of our infrastructure for the future, for today and tomorrow—and consumer incentives to purchase electric vehicles.

We also need to make sure that American taxpayer dollars are spent on American products. You know, that sounds simple, but that is actually not what is being done in every case right now, even though we have had laws on the books for decades and decades and decades.

My bipartisan Make It in America Act with Senator BRAUN makes it harder for Federal Agencies to use waivers to get around “Buy American” rules to purchase foreign-made products. Right now, there has not been enough accountability and structure to make sure that waivers are not being given so that purchases can be made of foreign cars. That needs to stop.

I also want to thank Senator TAMMY BALDWIN for her leadership on these “Buy American” issues as well.

The Federal Government is an enormous consumer, and we are set to make big infrastructure investments. “Buy American” rules means that American dollars flow into local economies when we purchase American-made PPE and American-made iron and steel and great American-made electric vehicles. These rules also create good jobs, and we will need highly trained workers to fill them. By investing in our workforce, which is an important part of this plan, we will help the 18 million Americans currently on unemployment find new opportunities—and others as well—new opportunities for good jobs and will ensure that our young people are on a path for good-paying jobs, including skilled trades, after high school.

I am laser-focused on supporting our community colleges and uplifting and expanding registered apprenticeship programs because these institutions and programs help build our middle class and ensure working people have the skills they need to thrive, not just survive. These are great-paying jobs, professional jobs, licensed, highly skilled jobs, and we need to be encouraging more and more young people to be able to choose these jobs.

Henry Ford once said this, one of my favorite quotes:

What's right about America is that, although we have a mess of problems, we have

great capacity—intellect and resources—to do something about them.

There is no doubt that we face big challenges, but Henry Ford was right: We do have great capacity, intellect, and resources to do something about them. Now is the time to do that, to act. People in Michigan have been waiting long enough, waiting way too long, and people across the country have waited far too long for us to act on what we know we can do to make things in America, to remake things in America, to build back better. We can make this an American moment, or we can sit back and wait for the future to happen to us.

This is the moment to invest in our workers who build our country's infrastructure, including those things we need today that they didn't need 100 years ago, like high-speed internet and electric charging stations, and the things that we will need to make us successful and global leaders moving forward.

We need to rebuild our supply chains in America so we are not being held up because of a really important part that is made only in one country halfway around the world. That is absurd. We can do that. We can do that. We can do that by deciding we are going to invest in America. And we need to use the power of American ingenuity to ensure a livable and prosperous future for everyone.

This is the moment to act. I am excited about that. I know that we have this moment right now to be able to jump-start the future, to be able to build our economy back better, to make things in America, and I hope we will seize this moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

COVID-19 HATE CRIMES ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today I express my concern over the rise in violent crime and in particular the hate crimes against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Every single one of us ought to be horrified to see our fellow Americans attacked because of their race or ethnicity. We are united in our opposition to this hateful violence. We are united in seeing it investigated and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. I introduced a resolution to this effect, and I will welcome all my Senate colleagues to join me.

I am very happy to see that Attorney General Garland has turned his attention to this problem. On March 30, he directed the Department of Justice to engage in a 30-day review of the Department's response to hate crimes. I hope the Senate will benefit from the results of that review. However, our responses to the problem of hate crimes must be guided by the facts and a pursuit of sound policy. I am not sure that we have done the legwork to arrive at a legislative solution that will make a difference to preventing, deterring, and punishing these crimes.

Along with my colleague Senator COTTON, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice and Counterterrorism, we are requesting a full or subcommittee hearing on the issue, and we should do that after the Attorney General's review has been completed.

We now have before the Senate S. 937, the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act, being introduced before the Attorney General's review began and appears to be duplicative or even in conflict with some of the DOJ's existing efforts. This does not seem to me to be the best path, but that is the path the Senate is on now, and I voted to proceed hours ago to S. 937. I am thankful that it is coming up. I know that Members of the Republican caucus have amendments that will hopefully improve the bill and make it a very useful piece of legislation.

We hope these amendments will be listened to and fairly considered by our Democratic colleagues. This is too important of an issue to get wrong.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, now, on another point. Between Democrats who believe Russia rigged the vote to elect Trump in 2016 and Republicans who believe various theories questioning Biden's election victory, they all add up to what seems to be a bipartisan supermajority of Americans casting doubt about our elections. In fact, one prominent claim by some Trump supporters that a particular brand of voting machine switched Trump votes to Biden appears to have been plagiarized from the Democratic Party's playbook from the election of 2004.

I heard from many left-leaning Iowans at that time who questioned President Bush's victory based on claims that a particular brand of voting machine switched votes in Ohio. That was 2004. It seems kind of similar, doesn't it, today.

Those totally unsubstantiated claims ultimately led Democrats to force a vote in a joint session of Congress in 2005 to reject Ohio's electoral votes cast for President Bush. There are still Democratic Members of Congress in both Chambers who voted to overturn Ohio State's certified election in 2004.

Now, after the 2018 gubernatorial election in Georgia, the losing Democratic candidate refused to concede, claiming, without evidence that would stand up in court, that she, as a Democratic candidate for Governor of Georgia, would have won but for voting irregularities. Now, rather than distance itself from questioning a certified election in 2018, the Democratic Party invited her to speak at their convention in 2020.

Two years later, the tables are now turned. Trump lost Georgia by a far smaller margin than that Democratic candidate for Governor in Georgia in 2018 did, but we are now told that to suggest that there were flaws in the 2020 Georgia election is somehow unacceptable and undermining democracy.

It is pretty obvious, after this history, that we need to break the cycle of partisans questioning elections when their side lost or it is OK to complain when their side lost, but if the other side does the same thing, there is something wrong with it. So there is a lesson for both Republicans and Democrats. Both parties must stop finger-pointing, stop blaming, and stop the partisan accusations. We all need to work together to restore Americans' faith in elections.

So that brings me to something very current because it passed the House of Representatives. So that brings me to the Democrats' so-called For the People Act. Incidentally, don't you find that name a little creepy? So often in history, when people claim to speak for "the people," they were just seeking power.

For the People Act was introduced after the 2018 elections as a clear political statement to build the hyperpartisan narrative that Democratic defeats were due to widespread voter suppression.

Now, we always hear about voter suppression before and since the 2020 election, but just think of the historic turnout—not only the historic turnout that the losing candidate had but the historic turnout that the winning candidate had. And yet we have voter suppression.

H.R. 1 was then, and remains, a hastily cobbled together collection of every Democratic proposal for new election mandates. No care was taken to make it cohesive or workable. It is evident that State and local election officials were not consulted in its drafting.

You know, just to consider the size of the bill, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, I think, was only two pages. For the People Act, the bill introduced—or heard—before the Senate Rules Committee is 800 pages.

Now, that bill that I just talked about had actually passed the House in 2019 on party lines and was placed directly on the Senate calendar at Senator SCHUMER's request. Now, this is very typical of political messaging bills so the minority leader can force a vote to proceed. I assume, in 2019, that Senator SCHUMER did not force the Senate vote to take up the bill because partisan activists got more traction out of blaming Leader MCCONNELL for not bringing it up. Regardless, in 2019, it was clearly designed as a messaging bill and not one designed to ever get to the President's desk.

Now, in 2021, we are back at it again, considering a totally partisan messaging bill that would radically rework all States' election systems, where it has been in the Constitution the primary concern of the State legislators and Congress seldomly intervening. I suppose the most obvious is that on a certain date in November we all have Presidential elections and congressional elections on the same date in all 50 States, but beyond that, it is pretty much up to each State how they want to conduct their elections.

So how does this bill, passing the House, once again, over here in the Senate—how does that jibe with the message from Democrats just a couple of months ago that State-run elections are beyond reproach? Don't you remember? Because all 50 States had State-certified elections, that gave Biden his win.

Now, it is pretty common sense. Either State-run elections are fundamentally flawed and unfair, requiring massive Federal intervention and Americans who question the outcome are taking a moral stand, or State-run elections are, by and large, very fair, and Americans can have confidence in the outcomes.

Either way, the same principle should apply to the last several elections whether Republicans or Democrats were relatively more successful in each case. I get it. I get it that having unleashed this partisan tiger—the bill that came from the House of Representatives—it is very hard to get that partisan tiger back in the cage.

But when this bill fails, as it must, we need to tamp down the partisan accusations and work across party lines to restore faith in American elections. Now, the way the environment here is in Washington and in Congress, it isn't going to be easy, but the alternative is unthinkable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to oppose the Democrats' latest liberal spending spree. Just over a month ago, Democrats put \$2 trillion onto America's credit card. They said it was for coronavirus. That was false advertising, and that is because only \$1 out of every \$11 in the \$2 trillion being spent was actually going to public health.

The bill turned out to be a big payoff to the people who run the Democratic Party: the union bosses, the DC bureaucrats, and the bankrupt blue States. Democrats crammed the bill through the Senate with just 50 votes. Democrats haven't even finished their victory lap.

Yet, at this time, they want another \$2.3 trillion. They have already told us they are going to cram it through with just 50 votes, once again, and, once again, they are using more false advertising.

President Biden calls this an infrastructure bill. Well, that is a new definition of the word "infrastructure." Only about \$1 out of every \$20 would go to roads and bridges.

Now, here are just a few other items that the Democrats call infrastructure: \$100 billion for so-called workforce development and over \$300 billion on housing and upgrading of Federal buildings—Federal buildings—the ones we work in. It includes \$100 billion for something called the greening of schools, which, when you go through

and see what does that include, it includes making greener lunches. It includes eliminating paper products in the cafeterias and making the cafeteria trays that people use to carry their food, makes each one of those into trays that can be recycled.

Call it what you will, this is not infrastructure. The largest spending part of the bill is \$400 billion to expand Medicaid. The list goes on and on. That is just the tip of the iceberg.

Now, some of the spending in the overall bill may have merit. That spending should go through regular order, going through committees and coming to the floor of the Senate for amendments and then votes.

But it is still not infrastructure. This isn't an infrastructure bill. Even the White House Press Secretary admitted it. She said this. She said it is partly infrastructure—partly infrastructure.

Now, the bill includes another big payoff to the union bosses because it forces long-term healthcare facilities to unionize if they want to receive the funding in the bill. There is Medicaid expansion. That would hurt States like Wyoming and others that protect and believe in the right to work.

The bill would also hurt Wyoming because of its attack on American energy. Representative ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ has compared the bill to the Green New Deal. One Democratic Senator admitted it. He said it is a way of accomplishing many of the goals of the Green New Deal.

Out of all the payoffs in the bill, one of the biggest goes to the electric car industry. The bill would spend more money on electric cars than it does on roads, bridges, ports, airports, and waterways combined—an astonishing amount of money.

President Biden announced the bill in one of America's greatest energy-producing regions, which is Western Pennsylvania. Yet energy-producing States like Pennsylvania and Wyoming have a lot to lose from this bill.

The bill would spend \$10 billion on something called the Civilian Climate Corps. These are taxpayer-funded activists who would advance environmental justice. That is what it says: \$10 billion to Civilian Climate Corps to advance environmental justice.

And then there is another \$35 billion on climate innovation and \$27 billion in clean energy and sustainability accelerator. It just seems that they are throwing money and names onto things. These are slush funds. They are going to give government bureaucrats more power to pick winners and losers in our economy.

We all remember the disaster called Solyndra. It was a Silicon Valley startup. The last time Joe Biden was in the White House, his administration, along with Barack Obama, gave them \$500 million—taxpayer dollars—for so-called clean energy. We later found out that Solyndra lied on their loan application form, and, apparently, no one in

the administration caught it. The company went bankrupt—500 million taxpayer dollars gone forever.

President Biden is bringing back this kind of central planning. It is all in the name, he says, of green energy. If we pass this bill, I will tell you that we are going to see another Solyndra and another one after that and another one after that.

So how are Democrats going to pay for this piece of legislation? Well, they are going to cram through the largest tax increase of the century. They are going to use 15 years' worth of tax increases to pay for 8 years of spending. So the spending is temporary, but the tax increases will be permanent.

If the bill becomes law, it will be harder for American companies to compete with companies in other countries, and the concern is that means more companies are going to move overseas because taxes there will be lower. When they do, they are going to take good American jobs with them.

You know, with the Republican tax cuts that we did in 2017, we saw \$1 trillion flow back into this country in just 2 years. President Biden is ready to send all of that money back overseas.

The official name of the bill is the American Jobs Plan. Yet it is not much of a jobs bill. The jobs this bill would allegedly create would cost \$800,000 each job. It is a lot to pay for a single job when communities all across the country have outside of their businesses "Help wanted" signs.

I saw one in Afton, WY, last week. A small community in western Wyoming there is a convenience store, and the sign said:

Your father called. He said you need a job. We're hiring.

There are signs like that all over the country. Small businesses and small business owners I have talked to continue to say: We cannot find people to hire. And yet the administration has a jobs plan, they say, where it is going to cost taxpayers \$800,000 for each job to create. At the same time, the bill is going to eliminate many good-paying energy jobs, and that is a real concern.

Democrats are cramming this through at a time when our economy is already recovering. The pandemic is coming to an end. The experts say we are going to create 11 million more jobs over the next 4 years even if we don't pass the bill. And there are jobs available today.

One analysis from the Wharton Business School said the bill would actually slow down the economy. That is because the bill would discourage businesses from investing. It is not an infrastructure bill, not much of a jobs bill. It is a slush fund for more liberal spending. That is what is on the minds of the Democrats who are pushing this bill forward.

It is not what the United States needs right now. We need real infrastructure improvements. We need a real infrastructure bill—one that will build road, bridges, our waterways, and

allow us to do things faster and better and cheaper and smarter. If Democrats want to do that, Republicans are ready to support it.

Last Congress, I worked with Senator TOM CARPER of Delaware on a bipartisan infrastructure bill in the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. I chaired it in the last Congress. Our bill was so bipartisan that Senator BERNIE SANDERS voted for it, and so did I. It passed the committee unanimously, 21 to 0. When we went to work with Democrats in the House on the legislation, they ignored it and replaced it with the Green New Deal.

That is what President Biden is doing right now as well. He is ignoring the bill we passed and trying to sneak the Green New Deal into law.

So I would urge my Democratic colleagues to reverse course, to throw out this liberal wish list, this slush fund of liberal spending, and start over working in a bipartisan way with Republicans.

We should start with a bipartisan bill that the Senate Committee on EPW passed last year. Instead of paying off the unions and the climate activists, let's rebuild our roads and our bridges and do it in a way that works for all Americans.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from North Carolina.

REMEMBERING ALVIN SYKES

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of a gentleman named Alvin Sykes, who passed away on March 19, 2021, in Kansas City, MO.

Teddy Roosevelt once famously said, in life, "The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who errs, who comes short again and again . . . but who does actually strive to do the deeds; who knows great enthusiasms, [the] great devotions; who spends himself in a worthy cause."

Alvin Sykes was the man in the arena. He was a man who knew great devotion, who dedicated himself to a worthy cause, and who helped move our Nation even closer to our founding promise of "liberty and justice for all."

Alvin was born to a teenage mother. He ended his public school enrollment after the eighth grade, but he never ended his education. In his own words, Alvin transferred from public school to the public library.

In the coming decades, Alvin immersed himself in learning about civil rights crimes and cold cases, becoming an expert on an often overlooked issue. He researched the history of these tragic crimes, the relevant laws, and the statutes of jurisdiction.

Alvin was so well versed, when he testified about such cases before Congress in 2007, one Member mistakenly assumed he was an attorney. Alvin replied that he was not an attorney, but

it was evident the knowledge and insight he possessed on these issues surpassed even the best-educated lawyers in this town.

What made Alvin so remarkable, however, wasn't the knowledge he acquired but what he did with it. As he learned more about unsolved civil rights crimes—the ones no one talked about, the ones no one looked into—Alvin realized we needed a system in place to investigate those cold cases and uncover the truth.

I met Alvin Sykes in 2016 through Senator Tom Coburn, a great and dear and missed friend today. Dr. Coburn ran into Alvin Sykes and heard this story and built a relationship that wasn't just personal—it was professional—because he wanted to help Alvin fix these wrongs.

Through Alvin's advocacy and guidance, I joined Congressman John Lewis—a civil rights icon who, sadly, also passed away this last year—to introduce the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Reauthorization Act. The legislation was named for 14-year-old Emmett Till, who was brutally murdered in Mississippi in 1955 and whose killers were acquitted.

After we introduced the bill, Alvin did what he had been doing for years: He went to work. He got in the arena. And he did not stop until there was legislation authorizing a Department of Justice unit dedicated to investigating and prosecuting cold cases that remained unsolved from the civil rights era.

To date, the Justice Department has investigated 152 cases under this program. And while many others were dedicated to making this a reality as well, Alvin's expertise, his passion, and his persistence were second to none.

Last year, Alvin reached out to me again, seeking to posthumously recognize Emmett Till and his mother Mamie Till-Mobley for their role in starting the civil rights movement. His advocacy led me to introduce legislation with Senator BOOKER to award Emmett Till and Mamie the Congressional Gold Medal, the Nation's highest civilian honor. I can't think of two individuals more worthy of it than them.

This bill is also a worthy coda for Alvin Sykes' life and his legacy. You see, Alvin was born only a year after Emmett Till's mother. And when he first became involved in that case, he heard Emmett's mother Mamie say she had been fighting to get justice since 1956.

Alvin said he thought to himself: I was born in 1956. That means she has been trying to do one thing my entire life.

Now Alvin is no longer with us, but the pursuit of justice for the Till family continues. My hope is that Congress will soon pass this legislation to recognize and honor their legacy. Today, though, I want to give Alvin the credit and the honor he deserves. His passion, his advocacy, and his high achievements made our Nation a better place.

Personally, I learned from Alvin Sykes. I admire Alvin Sykes. I mourn his passing. I pay tribute to him today and thank God that he created Alvin Sykes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES REPORT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the legislative activities report of the Committee on Rules and Administration during the 116th Congress be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY DURING THE 116TH CONGRESS FOREWORD

This report reviewing the legislative activity during the 116th Congress of the Committee on Rules and Administration is submitted pursuant to paragraph 8(b) of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Paragraph 8 provides that standing committees of the Senate shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, and execution of those laws, or parts thereof, the subject matter of which is within their jurisdiction, and submit to the Senate, not later than March 31 of each odd-numbered year, a report detailing the activities of that committee for the preceding Congress. The text of paragraph 8(b) of rule XXVI is as follows:

8.(b) In each odd-numbered year, each such committee shall submit, not later than March 31, to the Senate, a report on the activities of that committee under this paragraph during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

AMY KLOBUCHAR, *Chairwoman*.

JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration is set forth in paragraph 1(n)(1) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The following are excerpts from that paragraph.

RULE XXV

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or other-

wise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

* * * * *

(n)(1) Committee on Rules and Administration, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

1. Administration of the Senate Office Buildings and the Senate wing of the Capitol, including the assignment of office space.

2. Congressional organization relative to rules and procedures, and Senate rules and regulations, including floor and gallery rules.

3. Corrupt practices.

4. Credentials and qualifications of Members of the Senate, contested elections, and acceptance of incompatible offices.

5. Federal elections generally, including the election of the President, Vice President, and Members of the Congress.

6. Government Publishing Office, and the printing and correction of the Congressional Record, as well as those matters provided for under rule XI.

7. Meeting of the Congress and attendance of Members.

8. Payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same (except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee).

9. Presidential succession.

10. Purchase of books and manuscripts and erection of monuments to the memory of individuals.

11. Senate Library and statuary, art, and pictures in the Capitol and Senate Office Buildings.

12. Services to the Senate, including the Senate restaurant.

13. United States Capitol and congressional office buildings, the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution (and the incorporation of similar institutions), and the Botanic Gardens.

(2) Such committee shall also—

(A) make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress of the United States and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the United States Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution of the United States; and

(B) identify any court proceeding or action which, in the opinion of the Committee, is of vital interest to the Congress as a constitutionally established institution of the Federal Government and call such proceeding or action to the attention of the Senate.

* * * * *

RULES OF PROCEDURE

MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

Rule 1. The regular meeting dates of the Committee shall be the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 301, Russell Senate Office Building. Additional meetings of the Committee may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

Rule 2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into

closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (a) through (f) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the Members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings:

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if:

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulations. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

Rule 3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all Members of the committee at least a week in advance. In addition, the committee staff will telephone or e-mail reminders of committee meetings to all Members of the committee or to the appropriate assistants in their offices.

Rule 4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of legislative business and committee business will normally be sent to all Members of the committee and released to the public at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any Member of the committee from discussing appropriate non-agenda topics.

Rule 5. After the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member, speaking order shall be based on order of arrival, alternating between Majority and Minority Members, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

Rule 6. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the chairman may direct, unless the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member waive such requirement for good cause.

Rule 7. In general, testimony will be restricted to 5 minutes for each witness. The time may be extended by the Chairman, upon the Chair's own direction or at the request of a Member. Each round of questions by Members will also be limited to 5 minutes.

QUORUMS

Rule 8. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, a majority